

REMARKS

Applicant requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-13, 25-42, 44-50, and 53-57 are pending in this application, with Claims 1, 13, 25, 37, 40-42, 46, and 47 being independent. Claims 43, 51, and 52 have been canceled without prejudice.

Claims 1-13 and 25-36 have been allowed. Applicant submits that Claims 48-50, which each depend from an allowed claim, should also be allowed.

Claims 37-42 and 44-47 have been amended and Claims 53-57 have been added. Applicant submits that support for the amendments and the new claims can be found in the original disclosure, and therefore no new matter has been added.

Claims 37-39 and 42-52 stand rejected under 35.U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,268,926 B1 (Okimoto et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,061,700 (Brobst et al.). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

As recited in independent Claim 37, the present invention includes, *inter alia*, the features of (i) determining whether a number of printable pages of data selected from one or more web-sites that a user has previously been connected to exceeds a predetermined number of printable pages of data and (ii) printing one or more of the selected printable pages of data up to the predetermined number of printable pages of data, if it is determined that the number of selected printable pages of data exceeds the predetermined number of printable pages of data, and otherwise printing each of the selected printable pages of data. Independent Claims 40 and 41 recite similar features.

As recited in independent Claim 42, the present invention includes, among others, the features of (i) determining whether a number of selected web-sites that a user has previously been connected to exceeds a predetermined number of web-sites and (ii) printing the printable pages of data from one or more of the selected web-sites up to said predetermined number of web-sites, if it is determined that the number of selected web-sites exceeds the predetermined number of web-sites, and otherwise printing the printable pages of data from each of the selected web-sites. Independent Claims 46 and 47 recite similar features.

Applicant submits that the cited art fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-mentioned features. The Office Action correctly states that Okimoto does not disclose selecting a plurality of documents from documents previously accessed by a user. Applicant submits that Okimoto similarly does not disclose or suggest at least the feature of selecting one or more web-sites from web-sites previously accessed by a user.

The Office Action asserts that the above-noted deficiency of Okimoto is remedied by Brobst, which the Office Action says discloses selecting a “plurality of documents (web pages) from documents previously accessed by a user (evident that user selected reads on previously accessed documents by a user . . .).” The Office Action cites col. 5, line 21 - col. 6, line 53.

Applicant respectfully disagrees that Brobst remedies the deficiencies of Okimoto. At col. 2, line 67 to col. 3, line 5, Brobst discloses that each web server on the Internet has a known address, termed the Uniform Resource Locator (URL), which a web browser uses to connect to the appropriate web server. Because a web server can contain more than one web page, the user will also specify in the address which particular web page is to be viewed. Further, that patent discloses in column 1 (at lines 49-52) a drawback of prior art browsers that a user must invoke (i.e., activate) a web page before printing it. To address this drawback, Brobst discloses a

method of printing related web pages without the customary user interaction required to invoke and print each web page. See Col. 3, lines 31-36.

The portion of Brobst cited by the Office Action merely discloses a method for formatting a web page. Pages with links to each other may be arranged in a tree-like structure such that a user may choose a first selected web page 411 as a selected page and define a relation criteria of two nesting levels to collect related URLs. A print function can then print a conglomerate page comprising the selected web page's URL and all the related web pages. Thus, that patent actually teaches away from selecting one or more printable pages (or one or more web-sites) that a user has previously been connected to, because it teaches printing of pages with related URLs without the need for the user to access each page.

Further, Applicant submits that none of the cited art either discloses or suggests at least the feature determining whether a number of selected printable pages of data (or web-sites) exceeds a predetermined number. Instead, Okimoto merely discloses determining whether the number of blank sheets required to print a received mail message is higher to a prescribed number based on a mail header added to the mail message. Thus, it does not disclose a comparison between a number of *selected* pages or web-sites and a predetermined number, but instead discloses a comparison between the total number of pages in a particular mail message, as indicated by information in the mail header, to a threshold value.

Further, Applicant submits that none of the cited art discloses printing pages from one or more selected documents (or web-sites) up to the predetermined number, if the number of selected pages or web-sites is more than the predetermined number, and otherwise printing each of the pages of the selected documents (or web-sites). Instead, Okimoto relates to whether data will be compacted and printed on fewer sheets or not compacted and printed on more sheets.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that even if the cited art could properly be considered in combination, it does not disclose or suggest at least the above-mentioned features of independent Claims 37, 40-42, 46, and 47. Therefore, those independent claims are also allowable.

The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend, as well as for the additional features they recite.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, entry of this Amendment, withdrawal of the outstanding rejection, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant  
Brian L. Klock  
Registration No. 36,570

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200  
BLK\mj

DC\_MAIN 165034v1